interstate commerce on or about April 15, 1935, by the Biloxi Shrimp Shippers Association, Inc., Biloxi, Miss. (shipped from Westwego, La.), and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Raw Shrimp—Biloxi Shrimp Shippers Association, Inc. * * * Biloxi, Miss."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted of a decomposed animal substance.

On May 6, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

24784. Adulteration of frozen shrimp. U. S. v. 14 Boxes of Frozen Shrimp. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35452. Sample no. 28950-B.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of frozen shrimp which was in part decomposed.

On April 9, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 14 boxes of frozen shrimp at Boston, Mass., consigned about July 25, 1934, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by the Atlantic Coast Fisheries Co., from New York, N. Y., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On May 27, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. Gregg, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

24785. Adulteration and misbranding of imitation lemon extract. U. S. v. 39 Dozen Bottles, et al., of Imitation Lemon Extract. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. nos. 35453, 35475. Sample nos. 24297-B, 24383-B.)

These cases involved a product sold as imitation lemon extract. Examination showed that it contained no lemon oil, one of the declared ingredients, and that it contained a small amount of citral and had a slight citral odor and slight lemon taste. A product correctly described as imitation lemon extract should contain an appreciable amount of citral or lemon oil, and should have a marked flavoring strength. The bottles containing a portion of the product were not labeled with a declaration of the quantity of the contents.

On May 1 and May 8, 1935, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court libels praying seizure and condemnation of 39 dozen bottles and 50 cartons, each containing 72 bottles of imitation lemon extract, at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce in part on or about February 4, 1935, by the National Co.. from New York, N. Y., and in part on or about April 30, 1935, by the Drew Corporation, from Brooklyn, N. Y., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Certified Brand Imitation Lemon Extract Composed of Lemon Oil, Citrol, Alcohol, Water, Color Drew Corporation New York City, N. Y." A portion of the bottles were labeled "3 Fluid Ounces."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that a substance consisting essentially of water, a small amount of alcohol and a yellow coal-tar dye had been substituted for imitation lemon extract, which the article purported to be, and for the further reason that it was colored in a manner whereby inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, "Imitation Lemon Extract Composed of Lemon Oil, Citrol, Alcohol, Water, Color", was false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the product was an imitation lemon extract, and contained no lemon oil and but a trace of citral. Misbranding was alleged with respect to a portion of the article for the further reason that it was food in package form and failed to bear a plain and conspicuous statement of the quantity of the contents.

On May 18 and May 28, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.